

Fatherland. The German is a man of very deep and intense feelings, and once his feelings have riveted his attention upon an idea and warmed it into a conviction, they will not let his attention stray sufficiently for him to be reminded that some of his other well-beloved convictions are quite out of harmony with his new treasure.

The last few months have brought us illustrations of this peculiarity of German psychology which require no psychologist to interpret. The German explanations of the war and their various arguments on the subject have been truly Nietzschean, both in their consistency and in the emotion of conviction with which they have been pronounced. Thus, we are told, war is one of the most ennobling of human occupations, a priceless boon to the race, and one which, but for the military virtues of the Prussian state, might die out, with immeasurable loss to humanity; and we are also assured that the Germans are lovers of peace, hate war, and did everything in their power to prevent the rise of this one. With unwearied reiteration we are called on to believe that the real cause of the war was England's jealousy of Germany's magnificent foreign commerce; and that Germany, hemmed in by France and Russia, and kept by England from a place in the sun, was being strangled, and alone of the great nations had no outlet for her products. Austria had no thought of anything like aggression against Serbia; but, as Professor Delbrück puts it, Austria merely "demanded conditions which would have placed Serbia under her permanent control." We are assured that England had long planned the war, while to Germany it came as a terrible surprise; and also that England was contemptibly unready for it, while Germany, with characteristic efficiency, was prepared in every detail. The German press holds its sides in ridicule of England's wretched military equipment and pigmy army at the outbreak of hostilities, and assures us solemnly that England was on the point of invading Germany through Belgium. There have been no German atrocities in Belgium or anywhere else, we are authoritatively informed; besides, the atrocities are all justified by what the French would have done had they got across the Rhine. The sinking of British passenger ships without warning is also quite justified, because the 70,000,000 inhabitants of Germany are being literally starved to death for want of bread by the blockade of the Allies; a blockade which is altogether negligible, moreover, since Germany has a superfluity of breadstuffs and of everything else she needs or wants. . . . One might continue the list indefinitely.

It is difficult to understand how men of the intelligence which German writers, statesmen, and professors undoubtedly possess can hold all these contradictory views at once; but the explanation, as I have suggested, is probably to be found in the emotional—at times sentimental—type of thinking which seems to characterize the Teuton. So far as the mental processes involved in the German arguments can be put in terms of thought at all, one may say that all the conclusions are to be derived from the basal conviction (a conviction of a decidedly emotional type) that the *Vaterland* is in the right and all her enemies are wrong. All questions of fact or theory must be tried by reference to this burning conviction, and whatever reasonings or reported facts do not square with it your

German feels perfectly sure are somehow worthless—"a pack of lies." For *Deutschland*, *Deutschland über alles*. When *Deutschland* is concerned, talk not to the German of the calm weighing of facts. There is something finer than mere facts, and that is loyalty to the Fatherland. This is why we see all Germany united to-day, from the intellectual as well as from the military point of view—70,000,000 minds with but a single thought, and as many hearts that beat as one. And it is the beating hearts that determine the one thought in all these minds, though they belong to Junkers or Social Democrats, to professors or to *Pensionbesitzerinnen*. Whether Kantian, Hegelian, or plain *Naturwissenschaftliche*, the Germans of to-day at least are all good Pragmatists. The true idea for them is the one that works, that satisfies, that brings the desired feeling.

Und wann du gans in der Gefühle seelig bist,
Nenn es dann wie du willst. . . .
Gefühl ist Alles!

JAMES BISSETT PRATT.

Williamstown, Mass., April 12.

PRUSSIAN MILITARISM AND BRITISH NAVALISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a widely published letter to Ernest Ludwig, Consul for Austria-Hungary, Count Albert Apponyi, at one time Hungarian Minister of Education, joins the ranks of the German apologists in an attempt to convince the American people that they misplaced their sympathy in taking sides with the Allies. The Count confesses "that a feeling of irritation against the Great Republic spreads both in Austria, as well as Germany," and he fears that the United States has "irretrievably lost the confidence of one belligerent party." "What sort of spell," he asks, "has been cast upon the American mind that it should fail to perceive matters so obvious, so clear?" The war has been forced upon Germany and her allies "by the sacred duty of self-defence against wanton aggression."

As was the case with other champions of the German cause, Count Apponyi's plea will serve only to strengthen the belief of the American people that they were right in their condemnation of Germany's aims and methods. When will the apologists for infamous deeds realize that Prussian militarism has been stripped of every vestige of disguise it ever wore, and that most of the stripping has been done by its very defenders; that it now stands before the world in its hideous nakedness, and that any attempt at robing it again in its tattered clothes will be futile?

Count Apponyi would have the world believe that it stands in greater danger from what he chooses to call "English navalism" than from Prussian militarism. Unfortunately for the Count's appeal, the world knows what Prussian militarism stands for, what it is capable of doing, and what it would undoubtedly do should it be victorious in the war. As for England's great strength on the sea, which is essential to its very existence, the world may thank the gods for it, since it would otherwise be at the mercy of German *Kultur*.

Between English navalism and German militarism, the world does not hesitate. It knows the latter to be malignant, while believing that the danger of the former exists only in Teutonic minds. ALBERT SAUVEUR.

Cambridge, Mass., April 16.

THE ENGLISH TRADITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Professor Francke's address before the Economic Club in New York, as recently published in the papers, there are one or two points which seem to call for comment.

Professor Francke believes that the American people will come to recognize "that the higher justice in this frightful war, the justice that lies in the defence of *superior social conditions*, has been on the German side." (Italics are mine.)

Nothing, perhaps has been more striking in the German apologies for this war than the calm assumption of German superiority, unless it be the inability of German writers to perceive that such assumptions are not likely to render their cause more acceptable to other peoples.

Unnecessary and perfectly evitable as I believe this war to have been, it is becoming more and more clear that fundamentally it is a conflict between opposing and inconsistent social and political ideals: the German ideal of improvement imposed from above (a militaristic ideal) and the English and American ideal of improvement by individual development in freedom; on the one hand the ideal of the individual subordinated to the state, which is made an end in itself, on the other the state existing for the sake of the individual and as the servant, not the master, of the collected individuals.

Professor Clemen, of Bonn (not long since visiting professor at Harvard), has openly expressed Germany's view of this conflict as one for the dominance of the German idea (*die Herrschaft des deutschen Gedankens*). One is by this time accustomed to such statements from Germans. It is strange, however, that Germans long resident in this country should some of them fail to realize that in putting forth such claims they must necessarily arouse the profoundest antagonism in the mind of every thoughtful American. In essentials the English mode of thought and life, the English political ideals which they attack are American ideals.

Our whole American political and social thought—the very institutions of this country which German-Americans profess to support and of which they enjoy here the advantage—are English in origin and in essence. Without Runnymede and Lewes and Marston Moor there would have been no Bunker Hill, nor Saratoga, nor Yorktown. Without Langton, Montfort, Wycliffe, More, Ridley, Hampden, Milton there could have been no Washington nor Franklin nor Lincoln. The history of the origin and development of the American nation is one chapter in the history of the development of English freedom. This is a time when it seems necessary to insist on the obvious fact that, like our language, our literature, and our common law, our political and social thought, our whole spiritual and intellectual atmosphere are by inheritance and tradition fundamentally English. The immigrants who come to this country, the millions of Germans settled here, cannot escape this environment if they would. Many of the greatest advantages they enjoy are dependent upon it.

This English tradition we have modified—in some ways profoundly; but America and England have been progressing along parallel, if somewhat different, lines, and have greatly influenced each other. If both have been strongly affected also, often for good, by Germany, as by the thought of other civi-

ized peoples, this influence has not modified either the fundamental relationship on the one hand or the fundamental difference on the other. Fundamentally the ideals of the English-speaking peoples are one, and it is these ideals which now stand in conflict with paternalistic and militaristic Germany.

One other point. Regarding the danger Professor Francke thinks he sees in English sea-power, one can only judge from the way in which that power has hitherto been used. So far from endeavoring to drive other commerce from the seas, England has everywhere kept the open door. Herself the greatest exponent of free trade, she has allowed all the nations of the world to trade in Great Britain and in every crown colony on the same basis as English merchants. From this no people have more greatly profited than the Germans. In view of this it is difficult not to regard as disingenuous the German attempts to persuade Americans that the great power that has insisted on freedom of commerce for all is now to be regarded as its greatest menace. In view of Germany's infringement of the rights of neutrals and disregard of the dictates of common humanity in its barbarous and piratical submarine warfare against the world's commerce, is there not a peculiar irony in German expressions of condemnation against the expedient adopted by England by way of rejoinder, the blockade in which there has never been anything of ruthlessness or barbarity?

H. LANGFORD WARREN.
Cambridge, Mass., April 3.

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S DRAWINGS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The writer, having been entrusted by the heirs of the late Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Jr., with the publication of the architectural drawings of Thomas Jefferson collected by him, and of an accompanying essay on Jefferson's architectural work, is desirous of knowing of other drawings by Jefferson which may be in other hands, and which he might have an opportunity to consult. He would also be glad to know of relevant letters and memoranda existing outside of the principal public repositories of Jeffersoniana, and to obtain photographs of buildings, locally believed to have been designed by Jefferson, which may help to identify studies for unknown buildings existing among Jefferson's drawings.

FISKE KIMBALL.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., April 17.

THE JITNEY-BUS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Almost daily I see in the newspapers suggestions in the matter of the origin of the name "jitney-bus," none of which is acceptable. The following is, I believe, the correct solution of the question, and is much more reasonable than any I have met with. It is a corruption of the words used by the negro hack-men in the South when soliciting business. Indeed, I have had them accost me in the same words long before the jitney-bus traffic began. When spying a person seemingly on the lookout for a conveyance, they hold up a hand, and call out: "Git me, boss!" and the sound being indistinct, the pronunciation became "jitney-bus."

W.M. HARDEN.

Savannah, Ga., April 7.

Literature

DIRECT GOVERNMENT.

Progressive Democracy. By Herbert Croly. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.

The popularity of the Bergsonian point of view nowadays is evident from the extent to which it permeates what may be called "radical" or progressive thought. Mr. Herbert Croly's book on "Progressive Democracy" belongs definitely to the Bergsonian school, although no appeal is made to Bergson as authority, and the name occurs but once in the index. The reviewer's confidence in thus labelling the book is based mainly upon chapter ix, in which the author represents human society as a band of pilgrims. These pilgrims begin their journey in response to a "forward impulse" which is "instinctive rather than conscious" (p. 185). They are journeying "in the dark" towards some goal which is "as remote as it is desirable" (p. 184). Before knowledge came the travellers were "united by a blind impulse" (p. 185), but knowledge brought "light" and the unity of the band was destroyed, this at times causing the journey to be suspended; but the light continued to grow by accretion of experiences, and the travellers went on, now consciously united in the journey and the purpose. They are on the way to a "holy city" somewhere far ahead, and the great point is that they shall all be voluntarily agreed on continuing the journey to the "holy city." It doesn't much matter what road they take, provided that it be always forward, and provided that all shall have a firm faith in the ultimate goal and in the worth of the journey. By this faith both the individual members of the band and the band as a band attain to salvation.

Translating this into the concrete, Mr. Croly asserts that only by direct democracy, untrammelled by any imposed restraints, whether physical or dogmatic, can individual man and human society fulfil themselves. They can attain to fulfilment only by conscious, purposeful exercise of will, the individual will and the social will being distinct but interdependent, and each helping to perfect the other. Moreover, it must be democracy not merely in politics, but also in industry—in all the activities of life. Political democracy cannot succeed without industrial democracy—succeed, that is, in its real purpose, which is the enhancement of human life. The popular will must be wholly liberated, and it cannot be liberated in any other way. Neither men nor constitutions can be permitted to restrain it, and the best machinery of government is that which permits it the fullest and freest expression. Society is to be educated by self-government to increase its fund of social reason and improve the distribution of that fund. Responsibility will develop the qualities necessary for success in the task of self-government. And thus society will ascend in the scale of

development, with a corresponding advantage to individuals in society.

A form of direct government which Mr. Croly considers promising is that proposed in Oregon by the "People's Power League," of which Mr. W. S. U'Ren is secretary. The keynotes of this scheme are a strong executive, representing the political majority, a thoroughly representative Legislature, so elected as to give expression to minority phases of public opinion, and an effective system of direct popular control by recall and referendum. Under this plan the Governor has complete and exclusive executive power and appoints all officers, but is subject to recall. He may sit in the Legislature, introduce legislation, and vote on it. All appropriation bills must be introduced by him, and while the Legislature may reduce these appropriations, it may not increase them. Department heads will also sit in the Legislature, and can be questioned, as in England. The Legislature is to be chosen by a system of voting whereby—supposing the house to consist of sixty members—any one obtaining one-sixtieth of the total vote cast in the State is elected. Voters can vote for only one candidate, but can vote for any candidate regardless of district. No bill can pass unless it receives approval of members representing a majority of the total vote of the electorate. Members of the Legislature are also, of course, subject to recall.

In this way there would be a flexibility of action in response to popular will that is not possible under present systems. Mr. Croly thinks that, with such a system, the admitted dislike shown by democracy towards experts in administration would disappear and a degree of efficiency would become possible which is at present out of the question. The bureaucrat would be impossible. He contemplates, in fact, a "permanent body of experts in social administration. Just as the Executive and the Legislature would be concerned primarily with the more tentative and experimental part of the social programme, so the Administration would be concerned primarily with its comparatively permanent aspects. . . . Thus the experts charged with the administration of these laws would become the official custodians of a certain part of the social programme. . . . Their work in enforcing the law, in watching its operation, and in advising its amendment or supplementation, would be dignified by an element of independent authority. Representing, as they would, the knowledge gained by the attempt to realize an accepted social policy, they would be lifted out of the realm of partisan and factious social controversy, and obtain the standing of authentic social experts" (pp. 360-361).

The "progressive political democracy" on some such lines as those indicated above must rest, Mr. Croly believes, upon an "industrial democratic citizenship" by transformation of the present economic system. "If wage-earners are to become free men, the condition of freedom must somehow be introduced in the wage system itself. The wage-earner must have the same opportunity of being